UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,138	12/12/2003	William M. Quinn	LOT920050095US1_005	1935

51835   7590   06/15/2011
IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW
c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ
5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE
MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752

EXAMINER
JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/15/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 April 2011_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _12 December 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on April 4, 2011.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-6, 11-16, 18-19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a)   Regarding claims 2, 6, 12, 14, and 18, instances of "the software module" should be changed to "the third-party software module".

b)   Regarding claim 11, the underline in the limitation "a meeting service<u>s</u>" must be removed as "s" was added in a prior amendment and the claim indicates "Previously presented".

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

<u>Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101</u>

The rejection of claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. 101 in the Office action dated December 3, 2010 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

<u>Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103</u>

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claims have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6, 10-11, 16-17, 20-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Galli et al. US Patent No. 7,870,199 (Galli hereinafter).

As per claim 1, Galli teaches the invention as claimed including a method for integrating a third-party system with an online meeting system, the method comprising:

providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (col. 4, lines 59-64. Rich Instant Messaging (RIM) application. col. 5, lines 62-67. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application.);

implementing one of the procedures of the SPI in a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third-party software module performing, when executed, a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1. Third party services, e.g. Service_1 through Service_5.);

installing the third-party software module as a plug-in to the meeting services application (col. 5, lines 1-7, 62-66. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application. col. 6, lines 55-57; col. 7, lines 18-25. Register IMLet.);

receiving, from the meeting services application, a call to the implemented SPI procedure of the installed third-party software module to perform the meeting-related operation, thereby integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1. col. 5, lines 35-46. Use IMLet to create, update, publish content, facilitate communication, etc... col. 7, lines 4-11 Integrate third party service to IM session.).

As per claim 11, Galli teaches the invention as claimed including an online meeting system, comprising a server system having memory for storing program code and a processor for executing the program code, the program code including:

a meeting service application for providing online meeting services for users communicating with the online meeting system over a network connection (col. 4, lines 59-64. Rich Instant Messaging (RIM) application.);

a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with the meeting services (col. 5, lines 62-67. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application.); and

a third-party software module of a third-party system implementing one of the procedures of the SPI to perform a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system when the procedure is called by the meeting service application (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1. col. 5, lines 35-46. Use IMLet to create, update, publish content, facilitate communication, etc… col. 7, lines 4-11 Integrate third party service to IM session.), the third-party software module being installed in the memory as a plug-in to the meeting services application (col. 5, lines 1-7, 62-66. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application. col. 6, lines 55-57; col. 7, lines 18-25. Register IMLet.).

As per claim 17, Galli teaches substantially the invention as claimed including an apparatus for integrating a third-party system with an online meeting system, the apparatus comprising:

means for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (col. 4, lines 59-64. Rich Instant Messaging (RIM) application. col. 5, lines 62-67. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application.);

means for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI in a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third-party software module performing, when executed, a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Third party services, e.g. Service_1 through Service_5. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1.), the third-party software module being installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application (col. 5, lines 1-7, 62-66. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application. col. 6, lines 55-57; col. 7, lines 18-25. Register IMLet.); and

means for receiving, from the meeting services application, a call to the implemented SPI procedure of the third party software module to perform the meeting-related operation, and thereby integrate the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1. col. 5, lines 35-46. Use IMLet to create, update, publish content, facilitate communication, etc… col. 7, lines 4-11 Integrate third party service to IM session.).

As per claim 21, Galli teaches the invention as claimed including a computer program product for use with a computer system, the computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having embodied therein program code comprising:

program code for providing a service provider interface (SPI) defining a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system (col. 4, lines 59-64. Rich Instant Messaging (RIM) application. col. 5, lines 62-67. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application.);

program code for implementing one of the procedures of the SPI in a third-party software module of the third-party system, the third-party software module performing, when executed, a meeting-related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Third party services, e.g. Service_1 through Service_5. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1.), the third-

party software module being installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application (col. 5, lines 1-7, 62-66. Incorporate IMLet in RIM application. col. 6, lines 55-57; col. 7, lines 18-25. Register IMLet.); and

program code for receiving, from the meeting services application, a call to the implemented SPI procedure of the third-party software module to perform the meeting-related operation and thereby integrate the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system (col. 5, lines 1-6, 17-21. Through IMLet_1, communicate with Service_1. col. 5, lines 35-46. Use IMLet to create, update, publish content, facilitate communication, etc... col. 7, lines 4-11 Integrate third party service to IM session.).

As per claim 6, Galli teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of an event that has occurred in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting related operation in response to the occurrence of that event (col. 8, lines 6-15; col. 10, lines 31-34. Activate IMLet for third party service.).

As per claim 10, Galli teaches the method of claim 1 the method further comprising defining a first class that implements the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and implements the called SPI procedure that performs the customized meeting-related operation (col. 4, lines 11. API to integrate third-party services. col. 5, lines 17-21. Instances of IMLet provides third party services.).

As per claim 16, Galli teaches the online meeting system of claim 11 further comprising program code defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in

the first class (col. 4, lines 11. API to integrate third-party services. col. 5, lines 17-21. Instances of

IMLet provides third party services.).

As per claim 20, Galli teaches the apparatus of claim 17 further comprising means for defining a

first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second class that extends the first

class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures defined in the first class

(col. 4, lines 11. API to integrate third-party services. col. 5, lines 17-21. Instances of IMLet provides

third party services.).

As per claim 24, Galli teaches the computer program product of claim 21 further comprising

program code for defining a first class that implements the plurality of procedures of the SPI and a second

class that extends the first class and provides a customized implementation of one of the SPI procedures

defined in the first class (col. 4, lines 11. API to integrate third-party services. col. 5, lines 17-21.

Instances of IMLet provides third party services.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-3, 5, 8-9, 12-14, 18-19, 22, and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Galli, in view of Dalal et al. US Publication No. 2003/0014488 (Dalal hereinafter).

As per claim 2, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 1 wherein the called SPI procedure notifies the software module of a proposed transaction of an event in the online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs.

Dalal teaches of a method wherein a called SPI procedure notifies a software module of a proposed transaction of an event in an online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. Authorize before creating or deleting a conference.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the called SPI procedure to notify a software module of a proposed transaction of an event in an online meeting system to enable the software module to perform the meeting-related operation before the event occurs. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Dalal's teachings would provide additional services to the messaging application including security, which may improve multiparty communications.

As per claim 3, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 2, further comprising prohibiting the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure.

Dalal teaches of prohibiting the occurrence of an event in response to performing a meeting related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure (Paragraphs 0036; 0040. User not authorized to create or delete a conference.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to prohibit the occurrence of the event in response to performing the meeting related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure. The motivation for the suggested

combination is that Dalal's teachings would provide additional services into the messaging application including security, which may improve multiparty communications.

As per claim 5, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 2, further comprising modifying meeting-related information associated with the proposed transaction of an event in response to performing the meeting-related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure.

Dalal teaches of modifying meeting-related information associated with the proposed transaction of an event in response to performing the meeting-related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure (Paragraphs 0026, 0036, 0040. Authorize user, create a conference, add participant.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to modify meeting-related information associated with the proposed transaction of an event in response to performing the meeting-related operation implemented by the called SPI procedure. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Dalal's teachings would further extend the meeting application and provide additional functionality.

As per claim 8, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 1 wherein the call to the implemented SPI procedure occurs in response to receiving a user request to create, edit, or delete a meeting.

Dalal teaches wherein a call to an implemented SPI procedure occurs in response to receiving a user request to create, edit, or delete a meeting (Paragraphs 0026, 0036, 0040. Receive request to create or delete a conference. Determine whether user is authorized to create or delete a conference.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the call to an implemented SPI procedure to occur in response to receiving a user request to create, edit, or delete a meeting. The motivation for the suggested combination is that

Dalal's teachings would provide additional services to the messaging application, which may improve multiparty communications.

As per claim 9, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 1 wherein the call to the implemented SPI procedure occurs in response to detecting a state change of a running meeting.

Dalal teaches wherein a call to an implemented SPI procedure occurs in response to detecting a state change of a running meeting (Paragraphs 0065, 0068. Perform operation in response to request to join or leave a conference.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the call to an implemented SPI procedure to occur in response to detecting a state change of a running meeting. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Dalal's teachings would provide additional services into the messaging application, which may improve multiparty communications.

As per claims 12-14, the claims recite substantially the same limitations as claims 2-3 and 6, and thus are rejected under the same rational.

As per claims 18 and 19, the claims recite substantially the same limitations as claims 2-3 and thus are rejected under the same rational.

As per claim 22-23, the claims recite substantially the same limitations as claims 2-3 and thus are rejected under the same rational.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galli, in view of Dalal and Krishnaswamy et al. US Patent No. 6,909,708 (Krishnaswamy hereinafter).

As per claim 4, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 3, further comprising redirecting by the called SPI procedure a user of the online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event.

Krishnaswamy teaches of redirecting a user of an online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event (col. 61, lines 36-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to redirect a user of an online meeting system to an error page in response to prohibiting the event, which would improve user-friendliness of the suggested system by providing a user to be notified of an event.

Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galli, in view of Dalal and Nakajima, US Patent No. 6,289,510 (Nakajima hereinafter).

As per claim 7, Galli does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, further comprising installing a new software module that implements one of the SPI procedures, and dynamically integrating the new software module to the meeting services application without stopping the online meeting system.

Nakajima teaches of installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to a services application without stopping the online system (col. 5, lines 6-11; col. 13, lines 14-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one of the SPI procedures as taught by Dalal to be implemented by installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to the services

application without stopping the meeting system as taught by Nakajima. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Nakajima's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling addition of software without interrupting services (col. 2, lines 26-30)

As per claim 15, Galli does not specifically teach the online meeting system of claim 11, wherein the server system includes a means of storing software modules to be integrated in the online meeting system, and wherein the meeting services application periodically accesses the storage means to install dynamically any software module newly added to the storage means without stopping the online meeting system.

Nakajima teaches of a system that includes a means of storing software modules to be integrated in an online system, and wherein the meeting services application accesses the storage means to install dynamically any software module newly added to the storage means without stopping the online meeting system (col. 5, lines 6-11; col. 13, lines 14-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one of the SPI procedures as taught by Dalal to be implemented by installing a new software module and dynamically integrating the new software module to the services application without stopping the meeting system as taught by Nakajima. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Nakajima's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling addition of software without interrupting services (col. 2, lines 26-30). Although Nakajima teaches of accessing the storage means but not specifically periodically, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to request or obtain updated software from time to time in order to ensure that the system is operating with updated or newer software.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular sections of the reference(s) that are applied to the claims. While the sections are cited for convenience and are representative of the teachings of the prior art, other sections of the reference(s) may be relevant and applicable to the claims. It is respectfully requested that Applicant fully consider the reference(s) in its entirety when responding to the Office action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Joshua Joo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445